



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/685,362 | 10/10/2000 | Holger Hubner | GR 98 P 1513 | 3999 |

7590 03/13/2002

Lerner and Greenberg PA
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

WARREN, MATTHEW E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/685,362

Applicant(s)

HUBNER ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew E. Warren

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6, 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Election filed on December 20, 2001.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-9 in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 10-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 11.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung et al. (US 5,563,762) in view of Matsuoka et al. (US 6,130,449).

Leung et al. shows (fig. 3) a semiconductor component comprising a first metal layer forming a first metal area(128) and a second metal area (126) electrically isolated from each other. A dielectric layer (130) is formed over the first metal area. A second metal layer (134) forms a third metal area insulated from the first metal layer by an interposition of said dielectric layer, the second metal layer together with the dielectric layer and the first metal area form a memory element. The second metal layer (134) further forms a fourth metal area which together with the second metal area (126) forms a contact area to make contact with the second metal layer (134). The fourth metal area makes direct contact with the second metal area. The first and second metal layers are composed of a noble metal including platinum and the dielectric is composed of a ferroelectric (col. 11, line 43-col. 12, line 4). Leung et al. shows all of the elements of the claims except the insulating layer covering the contact area of the memory element and having an opening leading to the contact area. Matsuoka et al. shows (fig. 1) semiconductor device in which an additional insulating layer (901) is formed over a contact (704). An opening is formed in the insulating layer and leads to the contact area. The opening is filled with conductive material to form an external connection to the contact area. With respect to the limitations of claim 2, the contact area of combined cited references inherently forms an etching resist because it has the same structure and materials as the instant invention. With respect to the etching process of claim 2, a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually

made, In re Hirao, **190 USPQ 15 at 17**(footnote 3). See also in re Brown, **173 USPQ 685**; In re Luck, **177 USPQ 523**; In re Fessmann, **180 USPQ 324**; In re Avery, **186 USPQ 116** in re Wertheim, **191 USPQ 90** (**209 USPQ 254** does not deal with this issue); and In re Marosi et al, **218 USPQ 289** final product per se which must be determined in a “product by, all of” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that Applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. “Even though product-by- process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(citations omitted). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capacitor and adjacent contact of Leung by enclosing the contact with an insulating layer and adding a conductive layer as taught by Matsuoka to form an external electrical connection to the contact.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung et al. (US 5,563,762) in view of Matsuoka et al. (US 6,130,449) as applied to claim above, and further in view of Kuroiwa et al. (US 6,239,460 B1).

Leung et al. in view of Matsuoka et al. shows all of the elements of the claims except the fourth metal area separated from the second metal area by interposition of the dielectric layer. Kuroiwa et al. shows (fig. 1) a semiconductor device wherein a fourth metal area (116 right) is separated from a second metal area (130 right) by a dielectric layer (115) to form a second capacitor. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the contact of Leung and Matsuoka by forming a dielectric layer between a second and fourth metal area as taught by Kuroiwa to form a second connected capacitor.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rao et al. (US 6,222,216 B1) shows a memory device having a similar connection scheme as the claimed invention only differing in that doped polysilicon is used instead of metal. Yamamichi (US 5,847,423) and Kikushima et al. (JP 10-263440) also show semiconductor devices having a capacitor adjacent a contact structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Warren whose telephone number is (703) 305-0760. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, and alternating Fri, 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for


Art Unit: 2815

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

MEW

MEW
March 7, 2002



EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800